DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 817 HE 000 397

By-Vetter, Betty M.

Selective Service And Graduate Enrollments.

Pub Date 4 Dec 68

Note-14p.; Paper presented to annual meeting of the Council of Graduate Schools, San Francisco, California, December 4, 1968.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.80

Descriptors-*College Graduates, *Enrollment Influences, *Graduate Students, *Higher Education, Manpower Utilization, *Military Service

Identifiers-*Selective Service

The National Security Council decided in Spring 1967 that deferments should not be provided for first or second-year male graduate students in other than medical fields. The Council of Graduate Schools and the Scientific Manpower Commission then sent questionnaires to US graduate schools to determine how many male students would not be deferred, and found that about 70% of the potential first-year and 40% of the potential second-year male graduate students were draft liable. Taking advantage of this fact, students of both sexes sought entrance to institutions of higher caliber than those they would have applied to the year before, and institutions admitted more than their quotas in expectation of a high loss ratio in the fall. But between June and December 1967 draft calls were low, and a large number of young men returned to school without any assurance that they would complete even 1 semester of their graduate work. Because of these and other factors, 1967 graduate enrollments were not substantially below those of 1966. The National Security Council considered the deferment of graduate students to be unfair to underprivileged youth, who did not have either the opportunity or the funds to attend graduate school. It is felt that concentrated drafting of male graduate students could result in a loss to the nation of many years of needed technological service because of the interruption, and often discontinuance, of their graduate studies. (WM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Vetter

ED027017

Presentation to:

Council of Graduate Schools
San Francisco, California
December 4, 1968

SELECTIVE SERVICE AND GRADUATE ENROLLMENTS

by

Betty M. Vetter

Last spring, after the National Security Council decided that no deferments should be provided for first or second year graduate students outside the medical fields deferred by law, the Council of Graduate Schools and the Scientific Manpower Commission sent questionnaires to graduate schools across the country to try to determine the draft liability of the men who would normally have been expected to make up the first and second year graduate classes this fall.

The responses indicated that almost 70 percent of the men who would have been in their first year of graduate study, and almost 40 percent of the potential second year males would be draft liable under these rules.

In part on the basis of this information, a number of things happened. Many of the men who had planned to enter graduate school sought employment in the hope of obtaining occupational deferment. Students of both sexes who might otherwise not have applied to graduate school took advantage of the better opportunities for admission and placed applications. A number of schools overadmitted their quotas in the expectation of a high loss ratio before the fall term began. A number of students applied to institutions of higher caliber than they might have aspired to last year, thus, in general, filling the slots at the better institutions, but diluting the quality of students at every level below them.

HE000 397

Other factors also affected fall enrollment. The period between June and December was a natural period of low draft calls. In addition, Federal requirements to reduce expenditures cut funds available to Selective Service for physical examinations,

and the reclassification process for most of the June graduates and last year's first-year graduate students was relatively slow. Indeed, between 10 and 20 percent of these students apparently still had not been reclassified from last year's II-S (the student deferment) by the end of October. In addition, a high proportion of the graduate and graduate student group appealed their classifications, thus further delaying the date on which they were fully available for the draft.

Another step was taken by Federal agencies granting graduate fellowships, traineeships, and scholarships which generally assured young men who had earned such awards that if they accepted the award and began their graduate study, an interruption for service would not forfeit the award. This factor, plus the natural reluctance of potential graduate students to believe that the draft rules would not be changed induced a large number of young men to enroll this fall without any assurance of completing even one semester of their graduate work.

Some entered school believing they had been assured of limited postponements. An indirect statement by General Hershey that he would be willing to consider postponing the induction of a young man, who, in good faith, entered upon a course of graduate study and found himself liable to induction, was taken by many students and a number of administrators to be a promise that students would not be pulled out after the semester began. Some such students, now engaged in their basic training in the military service, were shocked to find that their failure to check with their local board to determine their place in line for induction before paying their tuition took them out of the category of entering in "good faith", and induction orders issued in the first few weeks of the term generally were not postponed. The State Director Advice of October 24, recommending consideration of such postponement, is believed to protect most students now in school to the end of this quarter or semester; but we do not yet know whether a similar period of "good faith" will be applied at the beginning of the second quarter or semester. Young men in final I-A status might be well

advised to check with their local boards before paying next term's tuition.

All these factors combined to produce a fall enrollment in graduate school that is not substantially below last year's graduate enrollment. The fall enrollment figures from the U. S. Office of Education are not yet available, but it is generally believed they will show no severe drop in enrollment.

It was apparent by the end of September that the number of gamblers in the student population - those men who had enrolled for graduate study despite their I-A or potential I-A status - was a major factor in the enrollment picture. Dr. Arlt, Dr. Kelly of the National Academy of Sciences Office of Scientific Personnel, the Scientific Manpower Commission and others made efforts to find out what plan any branch of the Federal government might have for determining the potential drop in enrollment if the "gambler population" were removed before spring. Some of us were surprised to discover that although the National Security Council had charged the Secretaries of Defense, Labor, Commerce, and Health, Education and Welfare with maintaining continuing surveillance over the nation's manpower and educational needs in order to identify any areas where deferment might be warranted, none of the agencies took that mandate to mean that they should check on the draft status of the graduate students enrolled in school. And so, after a few non-productive attempts to persuade the appropriate agencies to look into this problem, the Scientific Manpower Commission decided to try in a limited way to get some of the answers we felt were so vitally needed.

Through its constituent scientific societies, the Commission sent questionnaires to all departments offering graduate degrees in its specific scientific discipline, asking for total graduate enrollment, numbers of first and second year full and part-time students by sex, and requesting information on the draft status of each of the first and second year males enrolled for a degree in that department. We also asked how many students had accepted enrollment for fall, but did not enroll; and the reason they did not enroll, if it were known. These questionnaires were sent to all departments offering graduate degrees

in chemistry, physics, mathematical sciences, biological sciences, paramedical sciences, psychology, agricultural sciences, and geological sciences. May I emphasize that the Scientific Manpower Commission has long been on record as favoring deferment of graduate students in all disciplines; recognizing that the nation's needs cannot be filled now or later by technology alone. However, our survey was limited to these scientific disciplines because the others were outside our purview. We hope that other groups may be encouraged to look into the social sciences and the humanities by our efforts.

As of last week, approximately 50 percent response had been obtained, and analysis of these results is in progress. We expect to have final detailed results available in early January. We also intend to survey the same population in the early spring so that we may determine the situation at that time.

On a strictly preliminary basis, I might tell you first some things that we apparently will not find out. The data requested on total graduate enrollment within departments for the Fall of 1968 as compared with the Fall of 1967 appears too incomplete to be meaningful. I believe we will be unable to determine whether the proportion of part-time to full-time students has changed in any substantial manner. In some disciplines, a number of respondents failed to tell us last year's female enrollment, so we may be unable to tell whether the proportion of women in these fields has changed in any appreciable manner.

The information that does appear meaningful is the draft status of first and second year male graduate students now enrolled; the draft status of first and second year teaching and research assistants who are either full or part-time students; and the number of students who had accepted enrollment, but did not enroll in the fall term.

Perhaps the most surprising finding thus far is the high proportion of first and particularly second year students whose classification at the time of reporting - between October 21 and November 15 - was II-S, the student-deferred classification.

Certainly the great majority of these young men still were awaiting reclassification from last year, since such student deferment is denied to all of them this year. Preliminary analysis of the data indicates that their proportion of the total first year full-time male students in the various scientific disciplines ranged from 7 to 24 percent. In the second-year class, between 9 and 22 percent are still classified II-S. When students in all these disciplines were combined, the proportions in II-S in each year are about 10 and 18 percent. It is not surprising that more second than first-year students are still in II-S status, since, in general, they did not complete a degree in June, and therefore could have continued through the summer in student status.

In general, we can assume that there are only two major draft classifications into which this group of II-S students may fall - I-A or I-Y - those physically or morally unacceptable for service. A few may be able to obtain II-A deferment as teaching or research assistants, but the number of II-A's reported is ranging from less than 1 to about 6 percent - a very small proportion of the class.

Students classified I-A make up about 25 percent of the first-year class and 23 percent of the second. When students in I-A plus II-S are added together, they represent about 35 percent of the first year, and 41 percent of the second-year men. It appears then, that almost 40 percent of the presently enrolled male student body in these two years may be subject to induction orders before the school year is over.

Of the total number of teaching fellows or teaching assistants reported as first or second-year graduate students, 20 to 35 percent are in I-A and an additional 10 to 23 percent are in II-S. The proportion of first-year graduate students in I-A or II-S who are teachers appears in most disciplines to be lower than in the second-year group, where the proportion ranges from 40 to 49 percent. An average of 40 percent of all first-year students reported as teaching assistants and 48 percent of the second-year teaching assistants are classified I-A or II-S on the basis of preliminary analysis.

Among the research assistants, a major category in the fields of science we were

surveying, although it might not be an appreciable number of fields outside the scientific areas - the proportion in the first-year class who were I-A averages 25 percent, and in the second-year class, about 22 percent. When the I-A's and II-S's are combined, vulnerable research assistants make up 32 percent of all research assistants in the first year, and 44 percent of those in the second-year class.

Each questionnaire asked the department chairman to list the number of students who, at any time, had agreed to enroll this fall and did not enroll. If the reason for not enrolling was known, we asked that it be included.

Among the no-shows listed, this preliminary analysis indicates that 16 to 50 percent are known to have entered the service prior to enrollment for the fall term; 8 to 20 percent were known to have enrolled at other institutions; and 5 to 20 percent are reported as having entered full-time employment. Please keep in mind that about 100,000 college graduates are expected to enter service voluntarily during Fiscal 1969, in addition to those who are drafted.

I emphasize that these ranges are preliminary and incomplete. The final and detailed analysis by discipline of the result of this limited survey within science departments will be available in about a month and will include a great deal of information I have not touched on. We hope that graduate deans and graduate schools will find the information helpful in predicting the change in enrollment and in teaching and research efforts that may be expected through the months ahead.

Let us look for a moment at other information available to us, and examine its meaning.

The proportion of men holding one or more college degrees within the draftee population rose from 1 in 25 last January to 1 in 7 by August, 1 in 5 by September, to 1 in 4 by October. The draft calls can be expected to stay at the 25,000 to 30,000 level each month from January through June, and as local boards finish the reclassification process

for last year's II-S registrants, we can expect this proportion to go higher as we move through the school year.

According to the Census Bureau, slightly less than 10 percent of American men in the 25 to 30 year age bracket as of March, 1967, had completed four or more years of college. The percentage of draftees who are college graduates already is two and a half times that figure, and will go higher if there is no change in the regulations. I believe that our present and potential utilization of this limited national resource - our college graduates - deserves serious attention from the academic community.

It is important that we note that the young graduates who are drafted this year will have scant opportunity for service assignments related to the professions for which they have trained. Because they will be out of their professions for the period of time of their military service, not only will this number of man years of professional service be lost to the nation, but surely some men will not return to their professions or to their studies when they leave the service. Science and engineering particularly will suffer from this effect because these fields change so rapidly that some degree of obsolescence is the natural result of a two or more year period of non-participation.

Already these areas of study are in some difficulty. The total number of earned first degrees granted by American universities has increased almost 32 percent since 1961. But the bulk of that increase is not in science and engineering. Physical science degrees have increased less than 20 percent and engineering degrees less than 2 percent.

The problem has been compounded at the graduate level because of reduced support for graduate students in science and engineering - reduced both in terms of number of students supported and in percentage of students supported in relation to other disciplines. In the fall of 1968, 12.9 percent of all graduate students were receiving Federal support - down from 14.5 percent last fall. In the physical sciences, the percentage of students with Federal support dropped from 23.1 percent in 1960 to 13.6 percent in the 1967-68 school year.

lucation as a graduate discipline, meantime, has moved from the lowest percentage of tudents supported in 1960, 6.1 percent, to the highest in 1967-68, when 19.4 percent of ll graduate education majors were receiving Federal support. The possibility of an American technology gap" in the mid-seventies is not totally unrealistic.

Russia is presently graduating almost 140,000 engineers each year, roughly hree and a half times as many as the 38,000 graduated this year in the United States. ver a ten-year period, Russia will have trained a million more engineers than we, and few merican experts doubt the quality of Soviet engineering education. At the same time, almost 0 percent of the students in our engineering schools (and 16.4 percent of all our graduate tudents in the Fall of 1966) are citizens of other countries. While I am sure you will gree that we must continue to train young men from other countries, their percentage of ur total graduate students surely will increase under present draft rules; we must remember hat many of our own graduates will not be available to fill our needs.

There are times when a nation must postpone the training of the young in order to urvive. However, this nation is not in such a crisis. Our present military needs will re- uire drafting only about one-fifth of the young men who will be eligible and available for ervice next year. The fact that draft rules will concentrate that fifth in the college raduate segment of the population came about because the nation was looking for a way to ake the draft "fair." Deferment for graduate students and for new graduates was found, in he words of the National Security Council, to be "unfair" to "all the young men who do not ave the opportunity or the finances to attend graduate school." It was deemed expedient or the country to forfeit the national benefit of investment in further education for its rightest and most highly motivated young men so that they would not seem to be given rivileges greater than those accorded our high school dropouts.

And government leaders are not solely to blame. An activist student minority, hich makes up in publicity what it lacks in numbers, appears to many thoughtful citizens

to represent student opinion and activity. To the general public, there seems little reason to continue deferment for such students. Even undergraduate deferment is in jeopardy; and would already have been lost if Congress could have seen a way to procure military officers without it.

Universities, too, must take a major share of the responsibility for today's draft rules. Dr. Trytten has dealt with this, and I will not belabor the point, except to add that university spokesmen who proclaimed at length that graduate deferments were unfair might find it useful to ask whether the abolition of graduate deferments will result in a greater degree of equity to those who presumably were being discriminated against.

Let us look for a moment at that group we were trying to help - the underprivileged the unmotivated, and the unskilled.

Will the concentrated drafting of graduate students have improved their lot? Both the number and the quality of teachers will decline at every level from the graduate school to the elementary school. And yet good education surely is the principle key to helping the disadvantaged.

In the past few years, many young Americans who did not go to college, or even complete high school have seen the opportunities for learning and job training available in the Armed Forces. The Department of Defense operates the biggest single educational enterprise in the nation.

Young men of all races have found opportunity in service schools, but without the pressure of the draft on the 19-year-old who is neither in college, apprenticeship or a trade school, the major impetus to enlistment is lacking. While they may not recognize it, many of these young men will have passed by their last and best opportunity to prepare themselves for the upward climb into society.

At the same time, we have promised the boy who drops out of school early that he probably will never need to serve in the military because he won't be qualified. We have

encouraged his early paternity - if he prefers to avoid military service. We refuse to enlist the boy who has committed a felony - even if he has paid his debt in prison; and we will give boys without job skills or opportunities a longer period to get in trouble because the draft age will be kept high by the college students. For these non-college boys, to whom service schools represented opportunity knocking, we have removed the draft incentive.

We will further delay solution of many of the problems of the underprivileged. Even a massive inflow of new funding cannot solve inner city problems unless it is accompanied by creative concepts in design, in engineering, in medical research, in sociological inter-relationships and in scientific progress without which new technology remains impossible. By removing the most creative, the most idealistic, the most humanitarian part of our population from the environment which stimulates their creativity and their understanding; and by forfeiting their professional contribution for at least the man years of their combined service, we will further postpone the aspirations of the underprivileged. It will be difficult to explain to them that the delay was necessitated by the need to be "fair" to them.

I believe we also should consider the effect that will result from the changed attitudes of our young men and women as they view our national about-face toward education. After years of encouraging and stimulating them to continue their educational attainment; the nation has publicly reversed its position. Although we will allow our young people to go to college for four years, (and "four years is enough for anybody" in the words of one draft board) we will promise them that if they choose to go to college they must serve the military obligation for those who do not stay in school. They will forfeit forever the right to be deferred if they become fathers, although that right is reserved to all other American men.

Although we will continue to ask them to study conscientiously and to learn a special area of competence, we will promise to pull them out of that area for two or more years in the middle of their training or at the beginning of their professional apprenticeship

to serve their military obligation. We will hope that somehow they will return later to the areas where their training was concentrated; and that sufficient numbers of them will be interested in entering and ultimately continuing in fields where graduate training has become more and more imperative and where national shortages are most distinct. However, "hoping" may not be enough.

Military service is not and should never be considered a punishment. For all it is an obligation; and for many it is an opportunity. But the obligation is falling primarily on those young men who already have found their path to contributing to the nation with full training; and the opportunity will be lost to those who have acquired no skills, no training, and no hope of becoming productive members of society.

In the continuing struggle over the next decade with the problems of poverty, pollution, crime, transportation, urban blight, racial frustrations, and continuing threats from abroad, America will need all of its best young minds trained to the highest degree in a wide range of specialties and cross specialties. The graduate schools of this country have a vital role to play in this process.

I believe we have embarked on a dangerous national gamble which may leave us unprepared to meet our commitments, both at home and abroad. Apparently the Security Council believed that a government declaration that no skill shortages exist will make it so. But no governmental edict can metamorphose the high school dropout or even the half-prepared baccalaureate into a graduate scientist, sociologist, Chinese language expert, or engineer if we find ourselves short in the future. The lead time necessary to the training of specialists certainly is well understood by this audience.

Hopefully, now that the election is over, our new administration and a new Security Council can and will reconsider these decisions in the light of our long-range national needs. Perhaps all of us who are concerned with the need to keep the educational

pipelines filled can have found a common ground in our desire to serve the national interest before Congress again reconsiders the draft in 1971. Perhaps we can move out of the emotional atmosphere which has thus far prevented both university groups and our government from separating the problems of an unpopular war from the national continuing requirement to maintain the common defense.

Perhaps some of the more militant students and their faculty mentors can be persuaded that their methods of protest are delaying the attainment of their goals, at least in matters of the draft. And the most important "perhaps" of all, perhaps universities can be persuaded to speak with a common voice to governmental authorities in support of their essential function in providing for the national health, safety, and interest. Without this, I am convinced that no change is possible.

But decisions based on emotion sometimes are harder to overturn than those based on logic, and we have small reason for optimism.

One hundred seventy-four years ago, the great French chemist Lavosier stood before a French Revolutionary Tribunal and was condemned to die on the guillotine at the age of 51. Lavosier was the father of modern chemistry - he discovered the nature of combustion; started our present system of chemical nomenclature, and established quantitive analysis as a chemical tool. Lavosier asked his judge, Citizen Coffinhal, for a few days respite in which to record the results of his current experiments. Coffinhal rejected the plea with the remark, "The Republic has no need of genius."

The spirit of Coffinhal is clearly visible in the Security Council decision. We must continue to work toward a reasoned solution, and to hope that this 20th century judgment will not be as irrevocable as Coffinhal's; nor its results as irreversible as the guillotine.

* * * * * *

Fields included: Mathematical, Biological, Paramedical, Agricultural, Geological Sciences; Chemistry, Physics, and Psychology

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

DRAFT STATUS - FALL, 1968

First and Second Year Male Full-Time Graduate Students

Draft Classification	Range among Scientific Disciplines		Average of students in all Disciplines Combined	
	First Year	Second Year	First Year	Second Year
I-A (Draftable)	20% - 30%	20% - 25%	25%	23%
II-S (Student deferment)	7% - 24%	9% - 22%	10%	18%
II-S + I-A	20% - 40%	22% - 45%	35%	41%
II-A (Occupational deferment)	> 1% - 6%	> 1% - 6%	4%	3%

****

First and Second Year Graduate Students (Full and Part-Time) Who Derive Their Principle Support from Teaching

Draft Classification	Range among Scientific Disciplines		Average of students in all Disciplines Combined	
	First Year	Second Year	First Year	Second Year
I-A	20% - 35%	25% - 32%	30%	30%
II-S	6% - 26%	12% - 23%	10%	18%
I-A + II-S	26% - 47%	40% - 49%	40%	48%
II-A	0% - 8%	0% - 9%	5%	5%

****

(more)

Chart continued

First and Second Year Graduate Students (Full and Part-Time) Who Derive Their Principle Support from Research

Draft Classification	Range among Scientific Disciplines		Average of students in all Disciplines Combined	
	First Year	Second Year	First Year	Second Year
I-A	17% - 30%	18% - 24%	25%	22%
II-S	6% - 28%	10% - 30%	8%	20%
I-A + II-S	20% - 44%	25% - 48%	32%	44%
II-A	0% - 7%	0% - 4%	3%	2%

****